



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

DAS JOHANNEISCHE EVANGELIUM UND SEINE ABFASSUNGSZEIT. Andeutungen zu einer veränderten Datierung des vierten Evangeliums. Von O. WUTTIG. Leipzig : A. Deichert'sche Nachf. (Geo. Böhme), 1897. Pp. iv+134, 8vo. M. 2.

THE author of this booklet attempts to show that the fourth gospel was written before all the synoptics, about the year 62, the last chapter being added by John himself a few years later, soon after the death of Peter. For this thesis the author sums up his argument (p. 126) thus: "We have undertaken in what precedes to deduce the date of the composition of the fourth gospel from the gospel itself, from the object and plan of its composition, from the type of its teaching, from the selection and arrangement of the matter contained in it, in events, actions, and discourses, from the whole contemporary situation, and the knowledge assumed in the readers, from the contents and ascertainable purpose of the appendix, chap. 21, from the contents and purpose of the epistles in like manner ascribed to the author of the gospel, from the testimony of the gospel to itself, from the preface of Luke, from numerous details, and especially from the literary attestation and the church tradition."

In our judgment, Wuttig entirely fails to make his opinion seem a probable solution of the problem. Of course he assumes the authenticity of the gospel, and much that he says is valuable in favor of that view, which we also share. But he overstates the range of proving power in not a little of the evidence he adduces. Several of the points he makes in favor of the early origin of the gospel are sufficiently explained by the early origin of the tradition therein contained, if its source is the apostle John. Underlying a good deal of Wuttig's argument is a confusion of thought between the historical situation of the narrative and that of the author in writing. We also find a like confusion between the situation of the readers of the gospel and that of the actors in it. Besides this, many points are discussed on speculative grounds which have very little probative force. For example (p. 24): 'If the fourth gospel is historical and Jesus really made these Christological utterances, why may they not have been written down before 70 A. D., since like views are found in Paul's epistles?'

To those familiar with the subject, it will be sufficient to state some of Wuttig's main arguments. He finds, in John 20:31 (p. 8) and the many Old Testament connections of the gospel, reason for believing it was written for Jews. This loses sight of the great extent to which, in the apostolic age, all Christian instruction was mediated by the use of

the Old Testament, and would prove that most of Paul's epistles were addressed to Jews (*cf.* Acts 15: 21; Rom. 16: 26; Gal. 4: 21). He discovers that the main point in John, chap. 21, is the recent death of Peter, not the destiny of the beloved disciple (pp. 82-88). He interprets Luke 1: 1-4 so as to find therein a reference to the fourth gospel, as previously written and known to Luke (pp. 59-69).

Wuttig reproaches Grimm's New Testament lexicon (familiar to all in Professor Thayer's admirable edition) with making the fourth evangelist attribute to Jesus and his disciples an expression (*οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*) which in that meaning could belong only to a later time. But Wuttig himself does the same thing again and again, by assuming an exclusive adaptation of the gospel to its readers rather than to the actual setting of the narrative. Thus he affirms (p. 10) that John 10: 16; 12: 32; 18: 37 look to a future yet distant. But this can be evidence for an early writing of the gospel only if the phraseology is adapted to the point of view of the writer, or readers, or both, rather than to that of Jesus, to whom the words are ascribed. He calls attention (p. 19) to the fact that the discourses of the fourth gospel show no recognition of Gentile antagonisms in Asia Minor, which Paul refers to very clearly. But what historical basis would be left for a gospel *thus* fitted to its age? He even ventures to affirm (pp. 27-30) that the background of the gospel implies that all the institutions of Judaism were still standing when it was written. He has an interesting study of "The Jews" (pp. 38-52) in which he brings out finely the probability that the author was a Galilean, but here as elsewhere he overdoes the inference as to the kind of readers for whom the gospel was intended.

Wuttig's peculiar style of argumentation is exhibited in his treatment of the Logos doctrine of the fourth gospel (pp. 19-23).

He contends that its independence of Philo shows the early date of the gospel. For had it been written near the end of the century, John must either have borrowed more from Philo, or antagonized him more clearly. And then he proceeds to suspect Paul of opposing Philo, especially in First and Second Corinthians! He holds that the Christian development of the Logos idea in the second century points to an early origin for it in the first. Does not the fact that we do not find it mentioned before Ignatius, nor worked up before Justin, rather favor the view that it was not put into Christian circulation by the fourth gospel till near the end of the first century?

But the decisive point for Wuttig's thesis is the relation of the fourth gospel to the other three. Here he must stand or fall. He

does not appreciate the cardinal importance of this question, and his treatment of it (pp. 52-59) is very inadequate. He appears to think that if the author of the fourth gospel knew the synoptics, then we must concede that John, chap. 11, was worked up from Luke 16: 19 ff., and John 12: 1-8 from Luke 7: 36-50! He takes no account of most of the points of contact between the synoptics and John, such as are mentioned by Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 270-289) and Beyschlag (*Joh. Frage*, pp. 54-124), and he misstates the relation of John 3: 22-24 to the synoptics. Indeed he starts from false premises. He regards the synoptics as in the main independent of each other (p. 123, note) and also, apparently, founded on a wide and general knowledge of the materials for a record of Christ's work. It is now generally recognized that the synoptic tradition is limited in scope by the underlying documents, and by the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark and the Logia. The Johannean tradition, however, if the gospel is John's, was not limited, and this would explain the fact, which Wuttig notes, that the materials of the fourth gospel undoubtedly make the impression of a selection out of abundant stores, not of a mere gleaning after the three synoptics (p. 14). Under these circumstances it is much easier to account for the omissions of the synoptics if they preceded, than for those of John, if he wrote first. John's selection may be regarded as intended to supplement the synoptic record. For instance, Wuttig (p. 17) claims that it is very difficult to account for the insertion of the feeding of the five thousand by John if the three synoptics were known to him. But is it not clear that the miracle is narrated (with its pendant, the walking on the water) to introduce the discourse on the Bread of Life, which is untouched by the synoptics?

Wuttig cannot understand (p. 14) how the seven miracles in the fourth gospel could have been neglected by the synoptics unless they had already been used by John in a written gospel. We reply that they do give two out of the seven, and add nothing essential to the account in the fourth gospel (except Peter's walking on the water, in Matthew alone), so that the only reason why they omitted the other five is likely to be that these were not contained in traditions accessible to the authors, who were probably none of them eyewitnesses. These five miracles apparently belong to parts of Christ's life not included in the synoptic tradition. Finally, it may be asserted with little fear of refutation that all the correspondences between the fourth gospel and the rest are much less difficult to explain on the supposition that the fourth is the latest than that it is the first. Wuttig does not grapple

seriously with this problem, nor touch on many of the points of contact between the synoptics and the fourth gospel.

The book is acute and painstaking, and contains much that is valuable. But the author does not survey the whole field covered by his problem, nor does he show good judgment in weighing evidence or in estimating its range of effect. The chief value of the treatise lies in the fact that it furnishes some new points of evidence in favor of the genuineness of the fourth gospel.

C. J. H. ROPES.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Bangor, Maine.

DER NEUENTDECKTE CODEX SYRUS SINAITICUS UNTERSUCHT; mit einem vollständigen Verzeichniss der Varianten des Cod. Sinaiticus und Cod. Curetonianus. Von DR. CARL HOLZHEY. München: Verlag der J. J. Lentner'schen Buchhandlung, 1896. Pp. vi + 59 + 89, 8vo. M. 5.

COLLATIO CODICIS LEWISIANI RESCRIPTI EVANGELIORUM SACRO-  
RUM SYRIACORUM CUM CODICE CURETONIANO. (Mus. Brit.,  
Add. 14,451.) Cui adiectæ sunt lectiones e Peshitto  
desumptæ. Auctore ALBERTO BONUS, A.M. Oxonii: e  
prelo Clarendoniano, 1896. Pp. xi + 97, 9 × 11½ in.  
8s. 6d.

It will be convenient to notice these two books together, as their subject-matter is common. Each of them is occupied with a critical comparison of the text of the recently found Lewis Gospels of Mt. Sinai with the Cureton Gospels of the British Museum. Mr. Bonus' work in this direction is later in date than Dr. Holzhey's, though I cannot find any allusion in his book to the latter; and it supplements it in two important ways: (1) Mr. Bonus uses the more complete text of the Sinai Syriac Gospels which we owe to Mrs. Lewis' further investigations by which an astonishing addition (as well as very many corrections) had been made to the work of the first transcribers (see *Some pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* by A. S. Lewis; London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1896); (2) Mr. Bonus has added to his comparative tables of the parallel readings of the two famous old Syriac texts the corresponding readings of the Peshito. So that for the purposes of textual criticism Mr. Bonus' work puts that of Dr. Holzhey out of court. The former collation is now only useful to check the latter. Moreover, Dr. Holzhey was so sparing of his Syriac